UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | . FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/541,446 | 06/22/2006 | Takahiro Ueda | 5404/108 | 6380 |
| 757 | 7590 02/04/2008 ED CH SON & LIONE | | EXAMINER | |
| P.O. BOX 10395 CHICAGO, IL 60610 | | | KATAKAM, SUDHAKAR | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1621 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | • | 02/04/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | 10/541,446 | UEDA ET AL. | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| | | Sudhakar Katakam | 1621 | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | |
| A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply-and-will-expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI | N. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | |
| Status | | | | | |
| 2a) | Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 Ju</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E | action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro | | | |
| Disnositi | ion of Claims | | | | |
| 5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ | Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | vn from consideration. | | | |
| Applicati | ion Papers | | | | |
| 10) | The specification is objected to by the Examine. The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine. | epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj | e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | |
| Priority (| ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | |
| | t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 4) | | | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/5/05,10/06/05.12/20/05. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other: | | | | | |

10/541,446 Art Unit: 1621

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The examiner has considered applicant's Information Disclosure Statements of 7/5/07, 10/6/05 and 12/20/05. Please refer to the signed copies of the PTO-1449 forms attached herewith.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 4. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merck & Co., Inc (GB 947,643) and applicants' acknowledged prior art in view of Kijima et al (US 4,061,660), Kijima et al (US 4,039,573) and Morita et al (US 4,163,864).

10/541,446 Art Unit: 1621

Merck & Co teaches preparation and purification of reduced coenzyme Q_{10} from the oxidized form of coenzyme Q_{10} in ethanol and adding excess of sodium borohydride in aqueous medium and the resulted yellow orange compound is diluted with water and the compound is extracted with petroleum ether. The petroleum extracts are washed with water and then dried, which results in crystallized form of reduced coenzyme Q_{10} , the pure hydroquinone of coenzyme Q_{10} . This may be recrystallized from alcoholpetroleum ether mixture.

Applicants' specification acknowledges the impurities present in the reduced coenzyme Q_{10} such as oxidized coenzyme Q_{10} , reducing agents such as sodium borohydride, and known reducing agents such as zinc and vitamin C species [see page 1 of the specification].

The difference between the instant claims and the Merck & Co is that in the instant claims comprises washing crystals with water-soluble organic solvents and thereby remove a water-soluble impurities from the crystals, whereas Merck & Co teaches washing petroleum extract with water and then dried to get the pure crystals.

Washing and purifying crystals is a well known process in the art. It is desirable to use suitable solvents in which impurities get dissolved. **Merck & Co** is silent on the applicants' solvents; however it is a common practice to use suitable solvents in washing/purifying the crystals. For example, in the analogous situation of purification of similar compounds, the crystals are washed with water soluble organic solvents. **Kijima et al** (US 4,061,660) teach washing of crystals with diethyl ether [see Example 1]. **Kijima et al** (US 4,039,573) additionally discloses an analogous washing process

10/541,446 Art Unit: 1621

where zinc is the catalyst [see Example 3]. **Morita et al** (US 4,163,864) also shows an analogous washing process, where methanol is used for washing [see Example 1].

In-summary, **Merck & Co** teaches preparation and purification of reduced coenzyme Q_{10} from the oxidized form of coenzyme Q_{10} in ethanol and adding excess of sodium borohydride. Applicants' specification acknowledges the impurities present in the reduced coenzyme Q_{10} . An analogous prior art teaches the use of water soluble organic solvents in washing the crystals to remove the impurities.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to start with the **Merck and Co** teachings and combine the teachings of known solvents for the purification process, to achieve the instant claims with a reasonable expectation success. It is after all a simple washing to remove impurities using suitable solvents. The selection a solvent is depends on the solubility of the impurities.

Modifying such parameters is prima facie obvious because an ordinary artisan would be motivated to optimize the purification process to make the process more economical, since it is within the scope to exchange the solvents through a routine experimentation.

Conclusion

- 5. No Claim is allowed.
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sudhakar Katakam whose telephone number is 571-272-9929. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM 5:00 PM.

10/541,446 Art Unit: 1621

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on 571-272-0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sudhakar Katakam Patent Examiner 1st Feb 2008

PETER O'BULLIVAG PRIMARY EXAMINED GROUP 1200